

"THE TRUTH SHALL MAKE YOU FREE."—CHRIST.

The Christian Freeman.

A MONTHLY JOURNAL.

DEVOTED TO RELIGIOUS, MORAL, AND SOCIAL PROGRESS.

No. 3.]

MARCH, 1859.

[PRICE 1½d.]

THE CHILD ANGEL.

THE Nelson Hotel was the largest and most fashionable house of resort in a town on a sea-shore, a popular watering-place, famous in the annals of the wealthy. It stood not far from the brink of the sounding sea, and commanded a prospect of surpassing beauty.

Among the very select few who came here for the purpose of invigorating, and improving health, were a young couple by the name of Hayden. Harriet, the wife, was an interesting woman, not yet thirty, with a quiet gentle manner, and a voice whose every tone was music. She was a woman of Puritan extraction, and a sweet practical Christian. But the sweetest creature in this beautiful group was Antoinette Hayden, a child of three years. She was not robed in flounces, or laces, or ribbons. Her little limbs were unfettered by fashion, and had the freest play; her ways were all natural; her walk and talk and play were as a child's walk and talk and play should be.

Loose Ben was an uncouth caricature of a human being, of some sixteen years of age, slouching in his dress, dirty, sometimes ragged, bearing all the gibes put upon him with sullen mien and stolid silence. Loose Ben shuffled, looked suspiciously at every body from under his eyebrows, shrank from every human voice, never seemed to care whether they called him fool or knave, and only cared to gather his loose limbs together in some sunny place after his services were over for the day, and think—what could the poor outcast think? He was a German, and possibly never knew his parentage; he would not say whether he had any father or mother. It was his duty to make fires in the rooms of those who were invalids, in the early morning,

and for this purpose the father of little Antoinette employed him; for though it was summer time, yet the chill air of the sea made the early morning raw and cold.

So, with an armful of wood, Loose Ben wended his way to No. 56, a large room on the second floor. As he entered, Mr. Hayden glanced up from his dressing-table, and followed his lazy motions with his eyes for a moment. Little Antoinette sat on the floor by the bedside, half covered with the lace curtains that fell like spray over her spiritual face and figure. She, too, looked on earnestly, suspending her play for a moment, and then, as his labour progressed, she stood by his side. He gazed toward her, and seemed paralyzed into greater stupidity at her sweet smile. She did not mock him, scream out, or spring from him, as other children did, nor call him unfeeling names; but as she stood there with a saintly light on her brow, she laid one white, dimpled hand on his ragged sleeve, and with winning voice asked, "*Does you love God*".

He was too much startled for the moment to speak, but the great shining eyes beamed into his black-lustre orbs, and again that voice of surpassing beauty asked, "*Does you love God?*".

He looked up, then looked down awkwardly, and in his broad Dutch dialect said, half sheepishly, "*Ya-as*".

"Does you pray to God in the morning?" persisted the little one, still keeping her hand upon him—and he in the same voice answered, "*Ya-as*".

Then the little one seemed satisfied; she danced and capered about—chatted with this coarse, boorish boy—watched the curling flame, as it ascended, and built, all unconsciously, a fire of love and gratitude on the altar of that uncultivated heart.

The season went on, and Nettie's mother improved in health. The thin figure rounded out, the pale cheeks grew flushed, and she took long walks and drives along the quiet beach.

Every morning when Loose Ben came up to build the fire, that dear little voice would say, "Does you love God?"—and when he had answered with his stereotyped "Ya-as," she would add in precisely the same words as before. "Does you pray to God in the morning?" and again with that stupid, wondering look he would say, "Ya-as." But there was a change in this semi-barbarian. Gradually the rough, heavy locks were trained to fall back from his low, but full brow; his wood-colored face grew clean, and his great hands evinced some marks of attention. By some mysterious process his clothes were mended, and little by little Loose Ben seemed to emerge from his loutish shell into a region of freer scope. The hotel loungers still jeered him, still called him all kinds of strange and original names, but he did not mind them; and had one seen him going up to his daily duty to room 56, a smile might have been detected lighting up his homely face, till it was almost handsome. And as he entered day after day, came the same questions about love and prayer.

One Sabbath morning, never to be forgotten day, for I am telling no story of fiction, dear reader, the rap came as usual at room 56, and when the door was opened, in walked Loose Ben, worthy of the name no longer. He brought the wood not in his usual way, but in a basket, and, wonder of wonders! he was attired in a neat gray suit, from head to foot, and under his left arm he carried a straw hat bound with black ribbon. Leisurely he went up to the hearth-stone and set the kindlings and the wood in their place. Then he turned around to look for Antoinette. A little voice came from under the curtains—"Billy, does you love God? Does you pray in the morning?"

The boy drew his hands before his eyes, and as Nettie made herself visible, he went toward her, and fell upon his knees at her feet.

"You dear little angel," he sobbed, taking her dimpled hand, and covering it with kisses, "every morning you ask me that, and every morning I lie to you. Yes,

I lie to you; for I love no God as you say. Then, you ask me if I pray every morning, and I lie to you again, and keep lying to you, because I didn't know no better; Because I poor Dutch boy. But this morning, you dear little angel, I tell you I love God. I tell you I pray to God—yes, I love—I pray," he added, the tears running down his coarse cheeks, while Mr. and Mrs. Hayden stood looking on full of astonishment. "You made me go to God, you little angel, you—you make me pray to God, and I tell you no lie any longer."

Tears choked his utterance. Antoinette, scarcely knowing what it all meant, stood looking gravely toward him, a childish wonder in her face, until John Hayden snatched her from the floor and folded her with many kisses to his bosom.

The scene changes to a handsome dwelling in the city. Snow lays on all the streets, white and glittering—the naked trees, the gray caps of the houses, the iron railings, all are robed in the shroud of the autumn days. Ah! some cold wind, some snow has entered that house; the white drapery of the windows is unlifted; children go in and come out again with sorrowful faces—the passing traveller looks mournfully up as he wanders by—there must be gloom in that house—yes, the white snow of death lays upon the forehead of an only child.

She is in her coffin now, with roses above her pale bosom, and the little silver plate says "Antoinette Hayden, aged seven." What! is her mission done so soon? Does the angel bathe her wings in the light of heaven? Even so!

In a darkened chamber sat the mother of this lovely flower, bearing her grief alone with God. No sigh broke from her bosom—no tear fell from her eye; she looked calm—she was calm; but resigned as she evidently was, the stern immobility of her features told that grief, deeper than could find any outlet, lay heavy at her heart.

Rising up after her long vigil, she went noiselessly down stairs toward the room where her child slept the last long sleep. As she was entering, a voice struck her ear as if some long-remembered music had just sounded; the chord vibrated against her heart. She paused;

the voice asked for Antoinette—little Antoinette Hayden—and another voice mournfully murmured the sad truth.

"Dead!" exclaimed the stranger—"little angel! dead!"

And then came feet along the passage—and a tall, dark man stood before her.

"You do not know me, Mrs. Hayden," he said, as, after a moment, striving to possess his self-command, he spoke.

"I do not, indeed, replied the bereaved mother, in low tones."

"Ah! my dear madam, I am he whom your child's artless questions, morning after morning, pierced to the heart; I am poor Loose Ben. Day and night have the lovely features of that angel babe been before my vision. Every morning the clear, sweet tones have sounded on my ear—"Does you love God?"—and oh! I have come to find her in heaven." He bowed his head and wept, then softly followed the mourning mother into the shaded parlor. Death had not kissed even the freshness from the lips of the dear child. Death, as if he had no power to mar such loveliness, had not drawn one blue tint along the marble temples, or under the closed eyes. Death had not stolen one line of beauty from that heavenly face—it smiled in spite of death.

"Oh! Antoinette—dear little Antoinette!" sobbed the strong man—"you found me in ignorance, and blessed me with those holy hands—they were the first pure fingers that touched me with the touch of love, and made my buried heart throb with new life. O little Antoinette, you were the first one to lead me to my Saviour—on your infant breath my name was first carried up to Christ. O my lamb, canst thou not look down upon me, and see me bend over thee, blessing even thy inanimate clay? But the tomb cannot hold thee, my darling, thank God!—the tomb cannot hold thee, infant disciple. Already is she up there!" he cried, lifting his streaming eyes. "The brightness of thy glory, O Lord God of hosts, falls upon her temples. She hath led souls to thee, mighty Redeemer, and thou wilt give her a crown of life."

He ceased, and bowed his head upon the coffin. What oration before crowned monarchs ever reached the sublimity of this man's suffering over the dead

form of a little child! He had been converted through her ministrations, and since his entry into the Gospel ministry, he counted those who believed on Jesus through his faith and his ministry, by hundreds; and he laid his trophies in the name of Jesus beside the gentle child who had taught him Christ.

Reader, I have not written fiction. The dust of the child has slept in the green graveyard, where the flowers are springing to-day, twenty-three years. Twenty-three years she has been a seraph in glory. Twenty-three years she has looked upon Jesus, her Saviour, and her Redeemer. Oh! what do you and I seem beside this beautiful seraph? Though we drain off the fountains of earthly wisdom, we cannot attain to a tithe of that divine knowledge that fills her cup of bliss this day. Twenty-three years in the presence of the Lord of life, going up and down the steps of light—walking and talking with angels—pure—consecrate—holy!

And may not you and I win some stars to our crowns of eternal rejoicings?
—*Mother's Journal*.

WILL YOU ANSWER?

REV. A. C. THOMAS.

1. As we are required to love our enemies, may we not safely infer that God loves *his* enemies? If God loves his enemies, will He punish them more than will be for their good? Would endless punishment be for the good of any being?

2. If God hates his enemies, why should we love our enemies? Are we required to be better than our God? If God loves those only who love Him, in what respect is he better than the sinner?—Luke vi. 32, 33.

3. As we are forbidden to be overcome of evil, can we safely suppose that God will ever be overcome of evil? Would not the infliction of endless punishment prove that God *had* been overcome of evil?

4. If man does wrong in returning evil for evil, would not God do wrong were He to return evil for evil? Would not the infliction of endless punishment be proof positive that God was returning evil for evil?

5. Will not an infinitely good God do the best He possibly can for the whole

human family? Would not the infliction of endless punishment be the very worst that God can do for any being in the universe?

6. As we are commanded to overcome evil with good, may we not safely infer that God will do the same? Would the infliction of never-ending punishment be overcoming evil with good?

7. Is God "without variableness or even the shadow of turning?" If God loves his enemies *now*, will He not *always* love them? If God will always love his enemies, will He not always seek their good?

8. Is it just for God to love his enemies and be "kind to the unthankful and the evil," in the present life? Would it be unjust for Him to exercise the same love and kindness towards them in the future state?

9. Would it be merciful in God to inflict endless punishment? that is, would it be merciful to the sufferer? Can that be just which is not merciful? Can that be merciful which is not just? Do not cruelty and injustice go hand in hand?

10. Does divine justice demand the infliction of pain from which mercy recoils? Does the mercy of God require anything which his justice refuses to grant?

11. Does not mercy plead for the salvation of all mankind? If any other attribute of Deity pleads for a different result, why should the pleadings of mercy be set aside?

12. If the demands of the justice of God are opposed to the requirements of his mercy, is He not divided against Himself? If the requirements of his *mercy* are opposed to the demands of his justice, how can his kingdom stand?—Mark iii. 24.

13. If the justice and the mercy of God are in any way opposed, do they "keep the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace?" If divine justice and mercy are opposed in their requirements, can Deity be "a just God AND a Savior?"—Isaiah xiv. 21.

14. If "a God all mercy is a God unjust," would not a God all justice be a God unmerciful? Is there any such thing in Deity as *unjust mercy*, or *unmerciful justice*? Is there any such principle in Deity as *just cruelty*, or *merciful injustice*?

15. If you had the requisite power, would you not deliver the whole family of man from sin and misery? If you

were the final judge of all, would you doom a single soul to endless woe? Are you more merciful than the God who made you?

16. "Can a woman forget her infant child?" Is the Creator of human sympathy less benevolent than the creature? Is a spark more glorious than the flame?

17. If God *would* save all mankind, but *cannot*, is He infinite in power? If God *can* save all mankind, but *will not*, is He infinite in goodness?

18. Did God design universal salvation when He created man? Will he carry his original design into execution? If he fails in *one* of his plans, what evidence is there that He will not be defeated in them all?

19. Is every individual under obligation to be thankful for existence? Will this obligation always continue? Is it possible to be thankful for that which is not, on the whole, a blessing? If any one be rendered interminably wretched, will he still be under obligation to thank God for existence?

20. Would endless misery benefit the Almighty as *the inflictor*? Would it benefit the angels as *spectators*? Would it benefit the sinner as *the sufferer*? If it would not, who would be benefited by it?

21. Can God be glorified by that which gives him no pleasure? Would the ceaseless agonies of millions of our race afford any pleasure to the Deity? Could any but perfectly evil beings, if there be any such, rejoice in, or be glorified by, the infliction of unending torment?

22. Can the determinate *will* of Deity be contrary to his *pleasure*? If God declares "*the end from the beginning*," can the final destiny of mankind be contrary to his will?

23. Did God *know* when He created man that a part of his creatures would be endlessly miserable? If He did *not*, is He infinite in his knowledge? If he *did*, did He not *will* such to their final doom?

24. As Jesus "gave himself a ransom for all,"—1 Tim. ii. 6, can he ever "see of the travail of his soul and be satisfied,"—Isa. liii. 10, if endless misery be true for any part or portion of mankind?—Isa. xxv. 10.

25. As Jesus "tasted death for every man,"—Hebrews ii. 9, can it be true that "the pleasure of the Lord shall prosper

in his hand,"—Isa. liii. 10, if a part are never saved?—Phil. ii. 10, 11.

26. Can Jesus be the Savior of any more than he actually saves? Can he be "the Savior of the world,"—1 John iv. 14, if the world be not actually saved by him?

27. If Jesus be in no sense the Savior of unbelievers, why are unbelievers called upon to believe in him as their Savior? If unbelievers are not called upon to believe in Christ as the Savior, what are they to believe?

28. Must not the thing be true *before* it is believed? And must it not continue to be true, whether it be believed or not believed? Can faith create any truth? or unbelief destroy it?

29. "What if some did not believe? Shall their unbelief make the faith (or promise) of God of none effect?"—Rom. iii. 3. Is it true that "God hath concluded all in unbelief, that He might have mercy on all?"—Rom. xi. 32.

30. Can God be *especially* the Savior of them who believe, unless He be *actually* the Savior of all?—1 Tim. iv. 10. Is it not true *now*, as it was in the days of Paul, that those who trust in the living God as the *Savior of all men*, labor and *suffer reproach*?

31. Is "faith the substance of things hoped for?"—Heb. xi. 1. Do you *hope* for the doctrine of endless misery? If endless misery be not a thing *hoped for*, can it form any part of the Christian faith?

32. Do you pray for the salvation of all men? Do you pray in *faith*, nothing doubting? Are you aware that "whatsoever is not of faith is *sin*"?

33. Would God require us to pray for all men, and to pray in faith, unless He "will have all men to be saved?"—1 Tim. ii. 4. If you believe endless woe to be an item of the truth of God, why should you desire and pray that it may prove false?

34. Do the righteous desire the salvation of all mankind? Is it true that "the desire of the righteous shall be granted?"—Prov. x. 24.

35. If "whosoever offereth praise glorifieth God,"—Psalm i. 23, can He be glorified by those who *cannot* praise Him? If any one be endlessly miserable, will it be possible for him to praise God?

36. Do you believe that endless punishment would, in any sense, redound to the glory of God? If yea, can you

"rejoice in *hope* of the glory of God?"—Rom. v. 2. If nay, should not the doctrine of endless woe be blotted from your creed?

37. Would not the salvation of three-fourths of mankind glorify God more than the salvation of one-half? Can you heartily join the angelic host in singing "*Glory to God in the highest*," without believing in the salvation of the whole family of man?

38. Is endless misery embraced in the message of "good tidings of great joy which shall be to all people?"—Luke ii. 10.

If not, has that doctrine any part or lot in the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ?

39. Is it *certain* that all who are now alive, or yet to be born, will not be doomed to endless woe? If faith or good works, or both, be essential to the happiness of a future life, can it be *certain* that any of our race will enter that happy state, inasmuch as it is *not* certain that any one will continue faithful and obedient unto death?

40. If Christianity does not teach a *certainty* in relation to the future destiny of any soul of our race, is it not properly a system of *chance*? What is better chance than *Atheism*?

41. Is not the goodness of God co-extensive and co-eternal with his wisdom and power? As the wisdom of God can never change to folly, nor his power to weakness, will his goodness ever change to hatred? Can Deity be universally and eternally good, if endless misery be true for a single soul?

42. Is it true that the tender mercies of the Lord are over all his works?—Psalm cxiv. 9. Will not his tender mercies be *always* over all his works? If endless misery be true for any of our race, in what respect are the tender mercies of the Lord different from the tender mercies of the wicked?

43. If "the goodness of God leadeth to repentance," why should it be supposed that repentance, leadeth to the goodness of God? If "the goodness of God leadeth to repentance", are not *the impenitent* the objects of his goodness?

44. Can he be a Christian who affirms, that if he believed in the *certain* salvation of all mankind, he would neither worship God, nor obey the precepts of his heavenly law?

AMBROSE.

NEVER surely was holier man
Than Ambrose, since the world began;
With diet spare and raiment thin,
He shielded himself from the father of sin;
With bed of iron and scourgings oft
His heart to God's hand as wax made soft.

Through earnest prayer and watchings long
He sought to know 'twixt right and wrong,
Much wrestling with the blessed Word,
To make it yield the sense of the Lord,
That he might build a storm-proof creed
To fold the flock in at their need.

At last he builded a perfect faith, [saith:]
Fenced round about with "*The Lord thus*
To himself he fitted the doorway's size,
Meted the light to the need of his eyes,
And knew, by a sure and inward sign,
That the work of his fingers was divine.

Then Ambrose said, "all those shall die
The eternal death, who believe not as I;"
And some were boiled, some burned in fire,
Some sawn in twain, that his heart's desire
For the good of men's souls might be satisfied
By the drawing of all to the righteous side.

One day, as Ambrose was seeking the truth
In his lonely walk, he saw a youth
Resting himself in the shade of a tree;
It had never been given him to see
So shining a face, and the good man thought
'Twere a pity he should not believe as he ought.

So he sat down by the young man's side,
And the state of his soul with questions tried;
But the heart of the stranger was hardened
indeed,

Nor received the stamp of the one true creed,
And the spirit of Ambrose waxed sore to find
Such face in front of so narrow a mind.

"As each beholds in cloud and fire
The shape that answers his own desire,
So each," said the youth, "in the Law shall find
The figure and features of his mind;
And to each, in His mercy, God hath allowed
His several pillar of fire and cloud."

The soul of Ambrose burned with zeal
And holy wrath for the young man's weal;
"Believest thou, then, most wretched youth,"
Cried he, "a dividual essence of truth?
I fear me thy heart is too cramped with sin
To take the Lord in his glory in."

Now there bubbled beside them, where they
stood,

A fountain of waters sweet and good;
The youth to the streamlet's brink drew near,
Saying, "Ambrose, thou maker of creeds,
look here!"

Six vases of crystal then he took,
And set them along the edge of the brook.

"As into these vessels the water I pour,
There shall one hold less, another more,
And the water unchanged, in every case,

Shall put on the figure of the vase;
O thou, who wouldst unity make through strife,
Canst thou fit this sign to the Water of Life?"

When Ambrose looked up, he stood alone,
The youth, and the stream, and the vases, were
gone;

But he knew by a sense of humble grace,
He had talked with an angel, face to face,
And felt his heart change inwardly,
As he fell on his knees beneath the tree.

AM I NOT GOD'S STEWARD?

USE OF MONEY.—John Wesley lays down these three rules:—"Make all you can; save all you can; give all you can." To make without saving is useless and absurd, and to save without giving is miserly; to make and then save is wise, and to save and then give is Christian.

The time will come, and I cannot but hope that it is near at hand, when all the difficulty about funds for the spread of the Gospel will be done away, when Christians will learn a lesson, which hitherto they have been very slow to learn, that the richest enjoyment of wealth is to give its increase to the treasury of the Lord; and that the sweetest of incentives to labour is the hope of gaining something that we may aid in furthering the cause of God. The excuses for our want of liberality are utterly futile; they are worse, they are often impious. If we are Christians, let us act as Christians, and not dishonour the sacred name by a base, selfish, avaricious spirit, which keeps back from the treasury of the Lord what is due. If we are Christians indeed, we owe all our spiritual privileges and hopes to the Redeemer who toiled and died for us. Was he willing to endure so much for our salvation; and shall we be unwilling to give liberally of our worldly wealth in return, to promote his cause? The very heathen will rise up in judgment against narrow-hearted Christians; for they expend ten times as much on their idols as these do in supporting and propagating a religion which is truly divine, and which is the only hope of salvation. Oh, that men would remember that they are but stewards; and that God will require a strict account of the manner in which they make use of the talents entrusted to their care!

Oh, that every one would be continually putting the momentous question to himself—AM I NOT I GOD'S STEWARD? And again, What shall it profit me to gain the whole world, if I lose my own soul?

AN ANTICIPATED DELUGE.

At the end of the fifteenth, and early in the sixteenth century, Stauffer, the celebrated astronomer, was professor of Mathematics at Tübingen. This eminent man rendered great services to astronomy, and was one of the first who pointed out the way of remedying the errors in the Julian calendar, according to which time was then computed. But neither his abilities nor his knowledge could protect him against the spirit of his age. In 1524 he published the result of some abstruse calculations, in which he had been long engaged, and by which he had ascertained the remarkable fact that in that same year the world would again be destroyed by a deluge. This announcement, made by a man of such eminence, and made, too, with the utmost confidence, caused a lively and universal alarm. News of the approaching event was rapidly circulated, and Europe was filled with consternation. To avoid the first shock, those who had houses by the sea, or on rivers, abandoned them, while others, perceiving that such measures could only be temporary, adopted more active precautions. It was suggested that, as a preliminary step, the Emperor Charles V. should appoint inspectors to survey the country, and mark those places which, being least exposed to the coming flood, would be most likely to afford a shelter.

But the minds of men were too distracted for so deliberate a plan; and besides, as the height of the flood was uncertain, it was impossible to say whether it would not reach the top of the most elevated mountains. In the midst of these and similar schemes, the fatal day drew near, and nothing had yet been contrived on a scale large enough to meet the evil. To enumerate the different proposals which were made and rejected, would fill a long chapter. One proposal is, however, worth noticing, because it was carried into effect with great zeal. An ecclesiastic of the name of Auriol, said, it was practicable to imitate the course which, on a similar emergency, Noah had adopted with eminent success, and an ark was built.—*Buckle's History of Civilization.*

OUR BOOK, PAMPHLET, AND TRACT CIRCULAR.

[We offer a few lines in our pages for the gratuitous advertisement of any of the writings of our friends, book, pamphlet, or tract, designed to improve the social, moral, or religious life of the world.]

UNITARIANISM AND THE PEOPLE.—Three Sermons by the Rev. Brooke Herford, on the following subjects: "*Has Unitarianism a Gospel for the Poor.*" "*Has it been preached to them.*" "*How may it be preached to them.*" Published by Whitfield, London, and Johnson and Rawson, Manchester.—*Price 2d.*

THE UNITARIAN ALMANACK for 1859. Whitfield, London.—*Price 1s. 6d.*

TUNES FOR MARTINEAU'S COLLECTION OF HYMNS for the "Christian Church and Home."—*Price 5s.* WORDS IN WAR, being Lectures on life and death in the hands of God and Man, by a Christian Teacher.—*Price 1s.* A DISCOURSE ON THE POWER OF FAITH, by the Rev. P. P. Carpenter.—*Price 1d.* The three foregoing can be had at the *Oberlin Press, Warrington.*

THE PEOPLE'S DICTIONARY OF THE BIBLE, profusely Illustrated with Maps and Engravings, in two vols.—*Price 12s.* THE CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE OF PRAYER. By the Rev. J. F. Clarke.—*Price 3s.* SABBATH LEISURE. By several members of the Unitarian Church.—*Price 5s.* The three foregoing can be had of S. S. Laing, Lower Broughton, Manchester.

MELIORA: a Quarterly Review of Social Science. We beg to call attention to an able article, in the January Number, 1859, on "*Our Cotton Supply.*" Partridge & Co., London.—*Price 1s.*

HERALD OF PEACE. Published under the auspices of the Peace Society; monthly.—*Price 3d.* May be had of all Booksellers.

THE ACCOUCHEUR; a letter to the Rev. Mr. Tattershall, of Liverpool, on *The Evils of Man-midwifery.* By Jn. Browne. Published by Horsell, Paternoster Row.—*Price 1s.*

JESUS CHRIST in the GRANDEUR of his MISSION, the BEAUTY of his LIFE, and his FINAL TRIUMPH. By the Rev. E. Whitfield. May be had of Whitfield, 178, Strand, London. *Price 5s.*

THE MORTARA CASE.

OUR readers must all have heard, and heard again, of the *Mortara Case*, which simply means, a little *Jewish child* was taken by a Roman Catholic priest, and baptized, and carried away from its parents; the father and mother following after and protesting against this way of conversion, and the cruel robbery of their child. This barefaced trick of the priest, and the refusal to deliver up the child, at Rome, has caused some little unpleasantness on the Continent, and elicited further information on such a proceeding—taking people to heaven by force, “Compelling them to come in”, which will open the eyes of many who are blind to the iniquities of the Roman Church. In view of the Mortara case, a French Catholic paper (*L'Univers*) has published an article from the “organ” of the Pope of Rome, in which it is declared that the Church has rights before parents, and that when a child is converted and baptized into the Romish Church, that Church has the right to abstract the child from the parents, by force if necessary, and place it under the protection of the Church. This is an outspoken defence of the practice of baptizing, *per force*. *Punch* has very truly hit upon the plan by which this Church may have still greater valuable accessions, by contriving to get one of the large London *Fire Engines* into some corner of *Exeter Hall*, the first great *evangelical meeting*. Cardinal Wiseman must consecrate the whole of the water to be used in the cistern of the Engine, and then a number of the priests at the handles of this great Fire Engine, squirt the water over all these evangelicals, declare them baptized, members of the Roman, Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic Church. This is joking. It would be well though if priests would not give occasion for such jokes. The Mortara case has caused a search for precedents for stealing children. The following does honour to Clement. Pío Nono should not have been less wise. In 1774, Clement XIV. being pope, a little girl about nine years old, the daughter of Mr. McNamara, a Protestant Irish gentleman of wealth and standing, then visiting Nice, was entrusted to the care of an Italian lady, who

took the child to the Bishop of Nice, and had her baptized and confessed by that ecclesiastic, who also administered the sacrament. When the McNamara family wished to return to Ireland, they could not get their child from the Italian lady and the Bishop, who urged, as does Pius IX. in the Mortara case, that their consciences would not allow them to permit this brand plucked from the burning to fall again into the fire. On application the British government remonstrated with the Sardinian authorities, who referred the matter to the Court of Rome. The pope, far from defending the surreptitious administration of the Church rites, and the forced detention of the little convert, directed her immediate return to her parents, and suspended the proselyting Bishop for two years from the exercise of his episcopal functions. We have an account of an attempt to convert a dying Jew in America, in the same underhand manner. The following is from an American paper, “*Star of the West*.” “A Catholic priest attempted a surreptitious baptism in a hospital of the Sisters of Charity in St. Louis. A Hebrew captain, about 65 years old, was sick in the hospital, and requested a co-religionist named Gutman to have him buried in the Hebrew cemetery, declaring himself an Israelite. A few hours afterward, toward evening, when the captain could not speak any more, a priest came, and, assisted by the sisters, baptized the captain, notwithstanding the protests of Mr. Gutman. The latter, when they were gone, asked the captain if he wished to be baptized, in answer to which he gave the negative sign, and began to weep. Gutman consoling him, told him that the ceremony made no difference. The sister called him away, and told him to talk no longer to the captain, as he was now a Catholic. Finally, the sisters refused, on his death, to give the body to his Jewish brethren, until the mayor of the city intervened with the Archbishop, and that functionary directed its release. The Church, in its spirit, seems the same everywhere.” They seem really to outstrip the earnestness of the “*Society for the Conversion of the Jews*,” which can spend £30,000 for one or two converts. We are only sorry, that the Jews have great reason to complain, that

there needs a society among Christians, to inculcate better manners, decency, and common honesty, as another case or two we have before us will prove. A music teacher of the Catholic persuasion abducted a Hebrew girl, his pupil, about eighteen years old, and brought her to a Catholic priest in Posen, who baptized her and placed her in a nunnery. The parents remonstrated, they took the benefit of the law, the teacher was arrested and condemned to six months in the penitentiary, then forged papers were found with him, and he got two more years in the penitentiary. The girl was taken from the nunnery, she made a public statement that she was deluded, and was restored to her parents and their religion.—A few weeks ago an old Israelite fell down fainting in the street of a Bohemian village; the Catholic priest came and baptized the unconscious man. He recovered his senses, and was astonished that the priest insisted that he was a Catholic, and a Catholic he was according to the provisions of the concordat.

We read of a time in the history of the Christian Church, when christianity dictated justice to the secular power, and benevolence to all mankind. How things and times change, for now we find it often comes to pass that the secular power has to dictate common decency and justice to the highest dignitaries of the Christian Church. Can we do nothing to wipe out this reproach?

We will cheerfully do our part to extinguish *popery* everywhere. We frankly declare we would rather become members of the Jewish Synagogue, than of the Roman Church. And would rather see the whole of Europe embrace the Jewish faith, than the doctrines and spirit of the papacy. Few men would say that the celebrated John Foster was a narrow minded reviewer of other faiths, yet he says of the Roman Catholic Church, "A religion, the fundamental principle of which is *ignorance* and *implicit faith*; a religion, which is a *contradiction to reason*, its doctrines incredible, and its worship the very *dregs of pagan superstition* and enthusiasm; a religion which, by its compensations for moral guilt, by its ridiculous and slight penances, *soothes* and *encourages* the licentious passions of human nature; a religion entirely cal-

culated for the advancement of *priestly* power and grandeur; a religion founded on *fraud* and *imposition*, and propagated by *violence* and *blood*." And what are her fruits; let Macaulay (whom Catholics at times rejoice to quote) say:—"During the three last centuries to stunt the growth of the human mind has been the chief object of Romanism. Throughout Christendom, whatever advance has been made in knowledge, in freedom, in wealth, and in the arts of life, has been in inverse proportion to her power. The loveliest and most fertile provinces of Europe have, under her rule, been sunk in poverty, in political servitude, and intellectual torpor, whilst Protestant countries once proverbial for sterility and barbarism, have been turned by skill and industry into gardens, and can boast of a long list of heroes and statesmen, philosophers and poets. Whoever, knowing what Italy and Scotland naturally are, and what four hundred years ago they actually were, shall now compare the country round Rome with the country round Edinburgh, will be able to form some judgment as to the tendency of papal domination. Whoever passes in Germany from a Roman Catholic to a Protestant principality; in Switzerland, from a Roman Catholic to a Protestant canton; in Ireland, from a Roman Catholic to a Protestant county, finds that he had passed from a lower to a higher grade of civilization."

RELIGION IN INDIA.

UNDER British rule in India, there are nearly two hundred millions of people, and a very very small tithe of them are Christians, and never will be Christians as long as the doctrines of Trinitarianism are placed before them as true Christianity. We have shown in a former number how they puzzle the Missionaries, yea, silence them often on doctrinal points, and mock their perplexity. The following extract, in the "*Queen of Oude's counter Proclamation*," will surely merit the attention of those who think seriously of evangelizing India: it says,

"In the (Queen of England's) Proclamation it is written, that the Christian Religion is *true*, but no other Creed will suffer oppression; and that the laws will be observed towards all. What has the administration of Justice to do with the Truth or Falsehood of a Religion? That Religion

is true which acknowledges **ONE** God, and knows no other. Where there are **THREE** Gods in Religion, neither Mussulmans, nor Hindoos, may not even Jews, Sun worshippers, or Fire worshippers can believe it true."

Now we have proof that the pure and simple gospel, Unitarian Christianity, has power over the greatest minds among the Hindoos, while they neglect with contempt the doctrine of "*Three Gods*." You cannot bamboozle them about *one* being *three*, and *three* being *one*; they understand the matter at once to be a contradiction. We rejoice to subjoin the following statement of Philip Gangooly, a Hindoo Brahmin, converted to Unitarian Christianity under the ministry of the Rev. Mr. Dall, missionary of the Unitarian Churches to India. Here is his comparison of his spiritual condition before and after his conversion:

"When I was a Brahmin I used to devote nearly three hours in prayer and praise of gods of different names and natures. The appointed hours for worship were early in the morning, noon, and evening. I was a strict observer of all these. Fortunately a sudden but glorious change occurred in me. Christ performed all his miracles in me once more. I was sleeping dead in the grave of idolatry; like Lazarus, he raised me alive. I was blind; that is, having eyes, I did not see; the Savior made clay, put it on my eyes, and told me to wash in the Siloam of the Gospel; so doing, the beauty and grandeur of the kingdom of Spirit displayed magnificently before my eyes. I was deaf to the cry of humanity; the gentle voice of Jesus wonderfully entered in, driving every obstacle on the way. I was lame, could hardly walk upright before God, and used to lie down before the gods made of dust; but Christ raised me up, took me on his arm, wiped the dust from my body, and went rejoicing over me, the 'lost sheep.' And I was possessed of devils; 'legions,' for they were many; superstition, prejudice, hatred of my fellow beings, ignorance, etc.; these fled, trembling at the approach of the Lord, saying, 'What have we to do with thee, thou Son of God?' And again I may say it pleased God to raise me from the dust and degradation, that I being the son of God, may not lie prostrate before the hand-made, senseless gods."

A TESTAMENT FOR A BLOW.

"I *never* want to go to that school again, as long as I live, *never*," said Eddie, as rushing in from school with flushed face and soiled garments and bruised chin, he buried his face in his mother's lap and cried aloud.

Waiting a little for him to become calm, his mother wiped his face, and then heard his story, "Joe Douglass will never let me go to school in peace, or come home either. He is always taking away my books or catching off my cap and throwing it away, or throwing stones, or knocking me down, or something.—To-night, because I would not let him have my ball, he took it away, and then threw me down and struck me, and kept me from coming home till now. I *never* want to go to that school any more," and again his feelings burst forth into tears which he could not repress.

"Do you never try to irritate him, my son? Do you treat him kindly?"

I try to keep out of his way. I don't want to play with him."

"Why not let him have your ball? Perhaps he has none, and it might do him good."

"I have let him take my pencils and my knife, and he always says he lost them, and all the boys think he *keeps* them."

The mother thought awhile. There was no other school for her little son to attend.—She really pitied him, and tried to devise some way to soothe the feelings of the injured boy.

"Has Joseph any books of his own, Eddie?"

"No, mother, none that are good for any thing. The teacher sometimes lends him some, when his lesson is torn out."

"Has he a Testament of his own?"

"I don't think he has. He always reads from one of the other scholars."

"You saw those pretty new Testaments I bought the other day. Now I will give you one. You may go and pick out the prettiest cover, and if you wish, you may carry it to-morrow morning and give it to Joseph. I will write his name in it. Would you like to make him a present of it?"

It was a new idea to Eddie, but it

struck him rather pleasantly; and his eyes brightened, his tears were all dried, and with a little brushing and washing he looked quite like himself again.

The next evening his mother waited a little anxiously for his return from school, as the distance was such he could not return at noon; but the smiling, happy face showed no more marks of blows.

"Why, mother, he came towards me, saying, 'Now you'll get it, old fellow'; and I held out the Testament, and said, 'Here, Joe, I've brought you a new Testament'; and he looked, and looked, and I thought was going to knock it out of my hands; and I showed him his name, and told him you said I might make him a present of it; and he said '*I thank you*', and this afternoon he brought me an apple".

It is almost time for the school to close now, but there have been no more complaints of Joe Douglass, and Eddie says "Mother, what *shall* I do when the school leaves off".

THE FIRST WRONG STEP.

MANY years since, while travelling with a young friend, through an Indian wilderness, the road diverged very slightly, but seemed to make only a little island, and we felt sure that we would meet again a short distance ahead. He took the left. I kept the main path. First moments, then miles passed, and dark night came on, rainy and cold and drear enough, but we met no more! Thus it is in the world of mind. A man sets out in the vigorous pursuit of truth, all fresh with youth and energy. But he comes to a point in his progress where the road separates, ever so slightly it may be, seeming more apparent than real, and relying on the seeming rather than the sure, the wrong path is taken. A false conclusion is adopted, every succeeding step is but a farther divergence from the right, until truth is lost sight of, the mists of error hang thick on every side, and that mind goes out in the darkness of delusions, worse than death.

Precisely so in the moral world. The conscience, so tender of wrong, when its possessor first breaks away from a blessed mother's sight and voice and influence, starts almost at its own soft, sweet voice.

But as the day of life wears on, it loses its extreme sensitiveness, and while the young man "would not for the world" do what was positively forbidden, circumstances sometimes occur, where action is required without an express "thus saith the law," or a decided forbiddance; or if there be the slightest misgiving of a probability of wrong, there is a treacherous feeling that "it will all come right again," by prompt action, if circumstances require it; or that it will be rectified before it can be noticed. But "the first wrong step" gives direction to a second still more diverging, till in the course of weeks or months, or weary years, the man is waked up to the startling truth, that he is at a returnless distance from home and heaven.

In the pursuits of literature there are similar resemblances. The young at first read books of a standard character in science and in morals. Then come temptations to swerve from this straight path, and equivocal volumes are gingerly handled; next, those which they would not exactly care to be seen perusing. By degrees the tastes are vitiated, and they return no more to safe and solid reading, but go farther and farther away from purity and truth.

In the simple habits and practices of youthful life, we grow up to tastes and appetites healthful and safe; but once turning aside to indulgences, irregularities, stimulations, and pamperings, before he is aware of it, the unconscious victim has lost his relish for all that is simple, and safe, and pure, and good; and tobacco and wine, and seasoned food, and unbridled lust for mere animal gratification, disease the body, impair the intellect, debase the heart, and to simplicity of life and purity of taste, and their almost infallible attendant, glorious, joyous health there is a return, never!

In mind, in morals, and in medication, let all beware of "the first wrong step." Its beginning is in doubt. Its progress is in misgiving first, then infatuation; its end, the irretrievable ruin of intellect, and heart, and body; for all, together, go down in the night of mental error, of moral degradation, and of physical death. Hence we repeat with an emphasis, BEWARE OF "THE FIRST WRONG STEP."—*Hall's Journal of Health.*

EXPLANATIONS OF SCRIPTURAL TEXTS ADVANCED TO SUSTAIN UN-SCRIPTURAL DOCTRINES.

THE TRINITY.

The Concessions found in this chapter are chiefly taken from "Wilson's Concessions of Trinitarians," and "Illustrations of Unitarianism," two books which we should rejoice to find in every family; which may be had of Whitfield, 178, Strand, London. "The Concessions," 12s.; "The Illustrations," 6s.

THE doctrine of a "Triune-deity" is the foundation of a huge superstructure of false theology, which every lover of scriptural truth, pure christianity, and rational godliness should seek to overthrow. The early history of christianity bears testimony against it as an innovation and corruption of christian doctrine, a figment of the dark ages to harmonise the unity of God with the deifying of other two persons. It is opposed to the conclusions of reason; not above reason, but contrary to it. It was utterly unknown to the Jewish Church; the Jews always were Unitarians, and continue so to this day. It was never broached by Jesus Christ or his Apostles, or they would have called down at once the remarks of the Jews in that age: in short, it is both irrational and unscriptural, as some of its most illustrious supporters acknowledge, both in name and substance. We hold it is also very pernicious, corrupting the simplicity of christian faith and worship, and hanging on the chariot wheels of christian progress.—Every one of the following great names are Trinitarians; listen to what they say in this matter. *Dr. Jn. Owen*, says, "What is there in the whole Book of God that *nature* at first sight doth more recoil at than the doctrine of the Trinity." *Bishop Burnet*, says, "It is a vain attempt to go about to prove this doctrine by reason." *Robt. Hall*, says, "Where is the people to be found, where the individual, who learned the doctrine of the Trinity from the works of nature." *Cardinal Wiseman*, says, "Who will pretend to say, that he can, by any stretch of his imagination or of his reasoning, see it possible how three persons in one God can be one Godhead." *Dr. South*, says, "Were it not to be adored as a mystery, it would be exploded as a contradiction." *Soame Jenyns*, says, "That three Beings should be one Being, is a proposition which certainly contradicts reason, our reason." *Bishop Hurd*, says, on the Trinitarian scheme of redemption, approvingly:—"Reason stands aghast, and faith herself is half confounded." *Luther*, says, "The word Trinity is never found in the Divine Records, but is only of human invention . . . Far better would it be to say God, than Trinity." *Calvin*, says, "I hate this vulgar prayer, 'Holy Trinity, one God, have mercy on us,' as altogether savouring of barbarism." *Dr. Campbell*, says, "It were to be wished on topics sublime (the Trinity), men had thought proper to confine themselves to the simple but majestic diction of Sacred Scripture." *Bishop Tostat*, says, "It is evident that, from the authorities of the Old Testament, sufficient and clear proof cannot be drawn either for the Trinity, or for a plurality of divine persons." *Bishop Beveridge*, says, "Though (the Jews)

have had the law above three thousand years, and the prophets above two thousand years amongst them, yet to this day they could *never* make this an article of faith . . . but assert that God is only one person in one nature." *Dr. Hooker*, says, "Our belief in the Trinity, the co-eternity of the Son of God with his Father, the proceeding of the Spirit from the Father and the Son, . . . these, with such other principal points, . . . are in Scripture *nowhere* to be found by express literal mention; only deduced are they out of Scripture by collection." *Bishop Smalridge*, says, "It must be owned, that the doctrine of the Trinity, as it is proposed in our Articles, our Liturgy, our Creeds, is not in so many words taught us in the Holy Scriptures. What we profess in our prayers, we nowhere read in Scripture."

Our readers will at once perceive there can be little difficulty therefore in explaining every text alleged for the doctrine of the Trinity. It is really true what *Jn. Locke* said on this subject of texts: "There is scarcely one text" (on the Trinity) "which is not otherwise expounded by their own writers." So if each and every text is proved a mere cipher, for this doctrine, by Trinitarian critics, and you add them all together, you know what the sum of a million ciphers would be, *nothing*. And this is true, you will find there is in fact *nothing* in the Bible to support the doctrine of a Triune-deity.

TEXTS.

"In the beginning *God* created the heaven and the earth."—Gen. i. 1.

As it is sometimes said that the first text of the Bible proves the Trinity, we have introduced this. The word translated *God*, stands in the original *Elohim*, and this is said to be a plural word because of its termination *im*, and therefore there are three persons in the Godhead. The word *Elohim* is also in many other texts.—No person would think I was holding a serious argument if I should say because my name, *Spears*, terminates with the English plural form *s*, therefore I am a being of three persons; and this is just as the argument stands for the Trinity, from the word *Elohim*. It is curious that the Jews, to whom this language was first addressed, never discovered this, nor that the Trinitarians of the fourth, fifth, or sixth century, who ranged heaven and earth to find proof of the Trinity to support this new doctrine, and that this wonderful argument should be left unnoticed until the 12th century, when it was brought forward by Peter Lombard. But then it proves too much, for there are passages in which the name *Elohim* is applied to the Father alone, so the Father alone becomes plural.—Heb. i. 9; passages also in which the name *Elohim* is said to be applied to the Son alone, so the Son becomes plural.—Heb. i. 8. Unto the Son he saith thy throne O God (*Elohim*); also passages in which *Elohim* is said to be applied to the Holy Ghost—Gen. i. 2.—so the Holy Ghost becomes plural; thus, how many persons may there be in the Godhead—six, or nine, or nine hundred—if we go by the rule of reading *Elohim* a plural number of persons. But let us hear

what scholarly Trinitarians say on this argument. *Cardinal Bellarmine*, says, "I do not think that the argument is at all solid, since, according to the usage of scripture, the names of illustrious persons are put in the plural number, though the verbs retain their singular form. In Genesis xiv. 9, 'Abraham his lord' in the original is 'Abraham his lords.' *Calmet*, says, "That such expressions are found in the Hebrew, as in all other languages, and in passages where there does not seem to be any mystery." *Dr. Geddes*, says, "The plural number is no proof of a Trinity; it is truly strange that such a notion should ever have been entertained." *Calvin*, says, "To me it is sufficient that the plural number signifies the powers of Deity, which he exerted in creating the world." *Mercer*, says, "I agree with them in referring the usage under notice to a Hebrew idiom, but conceive that the plural noun is ascribed to God chiefly in order to express the fulness of his excellencies by which he diffuses himself throughout the universe, and exerts his majesty and power which are immense and inexhaustible." *Drusius*, says, "Who would affirm that there are various cities of the names of Athens, Thebes, Salamis, because these are severally spoken of in the plural number?" *Dr. Campbell*, says, "That Luther stood up for the Trinity from the word *Elohim*, but *Calvin*," he says, "refutes his argument, or quibbles rather, at some length." *Buxtorf*, says, "That the word *Elohim* is applied to heathen idols individually, to Dagon, the god of the Philistines, to *Ashtareth*, the goddess of the Sidonians, &c., &c." *Michaelis*, says, "If this word (*Elohim*) signified the Holy Trinity, it would imply that the doctrine was, by the constant use of the language, far better known under the Old Testament than the new." *Professor Stuart*, says, "For the sake of emphasis, the Hebrews commonly employed most of the words which signify *Lord, God, &c.* in the plural form, but with the sense of the singular." Surely the Trinitarian authorities that are on our side ought to make any one hesitate before they advance any such proof as we have noticed for a Triune-deity. The next four passages are of a similar nature—plural pronouns—and many of the foregoing statements apply also to these.

"And God said, Let us make man in *our* image, after our likeness."—Gen. i. 26. "And Jehovah God said, Behold, the man is become as one of us."—Gen. iii. 22. "And Jehovah said, . . . Go to, let us go down, and there confound their language."—Gen. xi. 6. "Also I heard the voice of the Lord, saying, Whom shall I send, and who will go for us?"—Isa. vi. 8.

We would beg the reader just to notice that for every one plural pronoun in the Bible, referring to God, we can find *one thousand* singular pronouns. The plural are less than a dozen, while every page and chapter contain singular pronouns when God is spoken of or speaking of himself. We will at once refer to the verdict of learned Trinitarians on this matter. *Dr. Croft*, says, "Perhaps too much stress is laid upon the expressions 'Let us make man in our image.'

The plural is frequently applied to one only; and the language of consultation is evidently used in condescension to human infirmity." It is dangerous to rest an article of faith upon that which may be only a mere idiom." *Bishop Tostat*, says, "In citing testimonies from the Old Testament" (plural pronouns), "nothing will be proved: for that plurality may be understood in a different manner, namely, that in the creation of man, God addressed the angels.—God, who is one, is here represented as speaking to the angels in council, or as deliberating with them; though, indeed, he never spoke, nor can speak." *Dr. South*, says, "The term 'Let us make' does not of necessity imply plurality, but may import only the majesty of the speaker: Kings and princes being accustomed to speak of themselves in the plural number; as 'We will, and require you, and it is *our* pleasure.'" *Limborch*, says, "This plural expression, therefore, does not denote a plurality of persons consulting with each other about the creation of man, but is a majestic style of speech employed by those who exercise great authority." *Mercer*, says, "God is represented as speaking in the manner of men, and particularly of great personages, sometimes in the plural number." *Rosenmüller*, says, "God's addressing himself in the plural number is to be attributed to the usage of the language; the expression *We will make*, not differing from *I will make*, any more than *Go to, let us go down*; for in neither passage is mentioned with whom God enters into council to perform these acts." *Dr. Geddes*, says, "Nor is it peculiar to the Hebrew. It is quite familiar to the Arabs. The Mussulmans are no Trinitarians, yet nothing is more common in the Koran than God's speaking in the plural number: 'We did—we gave—we commanded.'" *Calvin*, says, on the passage, "The man is become as one of us."—"From this place many Christians infer the doctrine of three persons in the Godhead; but, I fear, the argument is not valid." On Genesis xi. 6, 7, *Lyranus*, says, "That God here addresses the angels who are the ministers of the divine justice." *Bishop Tostat* says the same. On the passage in Isaiah vi. 8, "Who will go for us," *Le Clerc*, says, "God is here described as a sovereign, sitting on a throne, and addressing the seraphim, and asking his counsellors whom he should send to the Jews as the bearer of his commands. He, therefore, uses the plural number, *us*."

We have now completed our explanations of the word *Elohim*, and the plural pronouns, in the words of the ablest scholars in the Trinitarian Churches, Catholic and Protestant; so we think it is an ill founded sneer at these explanations of the Unitarians, as they are called. It is the verdict, the honest out-spoken conviction of men of learning, who could have no interests to serve, but those of truth, in such expositions.

We express our astonishment that any portion of the Bible should be cited for the Trinity, but we are astounded that some passages, which convey not the least hint of the existence of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, should be regarded as proof texts for this doctrine. Such as the following: "By the word of Jehovah were the

heavens made; and all the host of them by the breath of his mouth."—Ps. xxxiii. 6. "Seek ye out the book of Jehovah, and read; my mouth it hath commanded, and his spirit it hath gathered them."—Isa. xxxiv. 16. "Come ye near unto me, hear ye this; I have not spoken in secret from the beginning; from the time that it was, there am I: and now the Lord God and his spirit hath sent me"—Isa. xlviii. 16. "Whither shall I go from thy spirit? or whither shall I flee from thy presence?"—Ps. cxxxix. 7. Dr. A. Clarke says, on this text, "A Trinitarian would at once say, 'the plurality of persons in the Godhead is intended here.' And who can prove that he is mistaken." It must be a matter of amazement to the unprejudiced mind, that such texts as the foregoing should be dragged into such service. Some time ago, we read a work in defence of Mormonism, and under one section the writer proves, in his way, that the Bible bears testimony to the mission of Joseph Smith. Certainly, we looked, with some interest, to see the proof texts. This was the leading one: "Israel then shall dwell in safety alone: the fountain of Jacob shall be upon a land of corn and wine; also his heavens shall drop down dew."—Deut. xxxiii. 8. And who can prove, a Mormon may say, that the doctrine of Joseph Smith is not meant by the 'dew of heaven.' The same unsatisfactory plan is resorted to in defence of the doctrines of the Trinity. Several of the texts about to be advanced, our readers will wonder how they can be said to support the doctrine in question. So do we wonder, that such passages as the foregoing, and the following, "*Jehovah* bless thee, and keep thee: *Jehovah* make his face shine upon thee, and be gracious unto thee: *Jehovah* lift up his countenance upon thee, and give thee peace."—Numb. vi. 24, 26. "*God*, even our *God*, shall bless us. *God* shall bless us."—Ps. lxvii. 6, 7. "*Holy, holy, holy*, is *Jehovah* of hosts."—Is. vi. 3. We see the words *Jehovah*, and *God*, and *Holy*, are repeated *three* times, but we know very well that the people to whom these words first came, knew nothing of such a meaning, and even now it is mere fancy to suppose they refer to a Triune-deity. A near neighbour of ours, in his paper, a few weeks ago, said that the triangle was some kind of a proof of a Trinity in the Godhead, it having three sides. We had no doubt, had he lived among a people that believed in a *Quadrinity* in the Godhead, he would have found the *square* a kind of proof, with its *four sides of four persons*, in the Godhead. How shameful, we say, for men to trifle with *words* and *things* in such a way, bringing religion into ridicule among thoughtful men. But let us hear the opinion of a few men of learning, *Trinitarians* too, on the significance of these repetitions. *Eugubinus*, says, "There are many so ignorant of Sacred Scripture, as to infer the doctrine of the Trinity from the triple use of the divine name." *Bishop Tostat*, says, "Though *God* is here repeated thrice, a Trinity of divine persons is not proved; because, on that supposition, this name, when occurring four times in the same sentence, would also signify *four* divine persons, which is absurd." He says again, "The triple use of the word *holy*,

does not intimate a plurality of divine persons, but only that praise was frequently repeated." *Rosenmüller* endorses the following sentiments on the repetition, "Surely repetitions are void of mystery, and imply nothing but the unparalleled excellence of the thing spoken of, or some extraordinary emotion of the speaker. Thus the Jews cried, 'The temple of *Jehovah*, the temple of *Jehovah*, the temple of *Jehovah*.'—Jer. vii. 4, and 'O *earth, earth, earth!* hear the word of *Jehovah*.'—Jer. xxii. 29, and a similar mode of speech, 'I will *overturn, overturn, overturn it*.'—Ezek. xxi. 27; and David, says, 'O my son, *Absalom, my son, my son*.' By using the repetition of the word *holy*, therefore the angels show their ardent zeal in celebrating the divine holiness, and highly extol the perfection and excellence of God." Dr. South, says, "The threefold repetition of *holy, holy, holy*, applied to God, is urged by some to relate distinctly to the three persons of the Godhead. But this is thought by others to have so little of an argument in it as scarce to merit any answer, it being so usual with all nations and languages, to express anything vehement or extraordinary by thrice repeating the word used by them." *Calvin*, says, "I am disposed to think that plainer texts ought to be adduced, lest, in proving the chief article of our faith, we should become the ridicule of heretics. And undoubtedly, the repetition here denotes unwearied assiduity; as if the prophet had said, that there was no end to the melody of angels, in celebrating the praises of God." From the Concessions of these eminent Trinitarian scholars, you see there is not one particle of evidence in the Old Testament of a Triune-deity. We now proceed with the texts in the New Testament. Some learned Trinitarians have affirmed there are about a dozen texts in the New Testament which uphold this doctrine; some have doubted that there are so many, and confined themselves to six; others have not been sure of more than three, and some have been driven to stake the whole doctrine on one; while a number have confessed, *Trinitarians remember*, there are *none*, that it is a doctrine of inference *altogether*: this is certainly the true state of the case, as we now will prove.

"And, lo, the heavens were opened unto him, and he saw the spirit of God descending like a dove, and lighting upon him; and, lo, a voice from heaven, saying, This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased."—Matt. iii. 16, 17. "Go ye therefore and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the *Father*, and of the *Son*, and of the *Holy Ghost*."—Matt. xxviii. 19.

1. The meaning of these two passages is clear as day. That at the baptism of Christ the spirit of God descended upon him, and a voice came also from heaven, saying, This is my beloved Son. What proof is there here of a Triune-deity; *none*. We believe in the clear, obvious meaning of the passage, as the following Trinitarians express it. "That is, divine power came upon him. God operated on Christ, who at that time assumed the office of the Messiah."—*KUINOEL*. "This is my Son, whom I have sent on purpose to re-

veal my will by him; and whatsoever he teaches comes from me, and is perfectly my will or law." DR. HAMMOND. "I perfectly approve thy character, and acquiesce in thee as the great Mediator, through whom I will show myself favourable unto sinful creatures."—DR. DODDRIDGE. So all this is perfectly true, and this is Christian Unitarianism. Neither of these passages gives the least hint—read them over—that the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, are each God Almighty, coeternal and coequal; there is not one jot of evidence about anything of the kind. If any person should say they are a proof of the "North West Passage," you would at once say there was nothing about it in the verses. He might show you how it could be inferred from them; this is quite another thing. Men infer from Scripture many a strange whim, and there never was an inference more discordant with the teaching of the Old Testament and the New, than the doctrine of three persons in the Godhead. If the first text affirms a Triune-deity, then the following is a correct representation of the matter. That there was an Omnipresent God in heaven; another Omnipresent God in the air; another Omnipresent God on the earth. How absurd, and to what does such a doctrine lead us. We believe we have given the meaning of the passage in the words of Trinitarians themselves. The baptismal form, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, does not say they are all equal. Christ commands that baptism should be thus performed, and so we obey: In the name of the Father who is "Our God, and the God and Father of Jesus Christ;" also in the name of the Son who is our "Saviour," "Teacher," "Judge," "Appointed by God;" also in the Name of the "Holy Spirit," "The Comforter" (whether a person or an influence it is matterless, if by it we are sanctified and guided into all truth.) Because we baptize, it is said, in the Name of the Son and the Spirit, they also must be God. We read, 1 Cor. x. 2, "The Israelites were all baptized unto Moses, in the cloud and in the sea." It does not follow that Moses was God. But it would be blasphemy, some say, to connect the name of God with other names, if they were not God. This is simply an unfounded assertion, and contrary to Scriptural facts. We read, "The people feared Jehovah, and believed *Jehovah*, and his servant *Moses*."—Exodus xiv. 31. "And the people spake against *God*, and against *Moses*."—Numb. xxi. 5. Thus we have the expression of a people's religious faith and life, and the name of *Jehovah* and *Moses* joined together; is this blasphemy? we hope you are not so reckless as to say that a mere association of names in *divine commands, or religious ordinances*, lead to any such conclusions as equality or blasphemy, with the Bible in your hands. As this verse is regarded as the clearest proof of the Trinity in the Bible, we subjoin the following remarks upon it, by learned Trinitarians. "In consequence of the power which I have received from God, I appoint you to go amongst all nations."—LE CLERC. "The phrase in the name . . . signifies in strictness, *into* the Name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost;" which word, *into*, the New Testament uses nine times besides, in speaking of baptism; whereas it uses a word

signifying in but once besides."—ARCHBISHOP SECKER. "To be baptized in the name of *any one* is, by baptism, to be bound to observe the religious observances instituted by him."—BISHOP BLOOMFIELD. "To be baptized into, or in the name, is to be baptized into the faith or confession, or in token of one's faith, and of one's openly confessing."—PARKHURST. "When the Christian religion was published; as proselytes to the old dispensation had been baptized into Moses, taking him for their lawgiver and instructor; so believers in the new dispensation were baptized into Christ, receiving him for their Lord and Master."—SECKER. "We are baptized *into the Father*, as the Author of a new religion; *into the Son*, as the Lord of a new Church; and *into the Holy Spirit*, as the guardian and assistant of this Church."—ROSENMULLER. "I am disposed to admit, that my language in affirming that this passage necessarily implies an act of worship, was too strong and unqualified. That it *does* I still have no doubt. But I am satisfied that this arises, in a considerable degree, from my views of the nature of the ordinance of baptism, along with my previous conviction of the doctrine of the Trinity."—DR. WARDLAW. "Though the three persons are indeed named, no mention is made of a unity, and of a real distinction of persons."—NIHUSIUS. "We know how frequently this passage is quoted as a proof of the doctrine, by many indeed, who do not believe this doctrine, and wish perhaps to undermine it. I must confess that I cannot see it in this point of view. The eternal Divinity of the Son—which is so clearly taught in other passages . . . is here not once mentioned; and it is impossible from this passage to understand whether the Holy Ghost is a person. The meaning of Jesus may have been this: Those who were baptized should, upon their baptism, confess that they believed in the Father, and in the Son, and in all the doctrines inculcated by the Holy Spirit."—*Michaelis*. In the foregoing passages our readers will perceive the meaning of this text is given, and it is conceded that it does not teach a Triune-deity. It must greatly perplex those who think about it, that there is not a text in the Bible which affirms the Trinity, the supposed fundamental doctrine of true Religion. (*To be continued.*)

ATHANASIAN CREED.—*Profane curvettings and noises in Church, during the operation of reading this truly admirable part of divine service.* "Whereas, in sundry places, and at divers times of late, much scandal hath been given in rehearsing this grande decus columenque of the ancient and modern Church of England. This is to give notice, that at the ensuing festival, no person hawk, spit, cough, groan, or utter any other unseemly noise, during the solemn recital thereof by the minister—nor twirl his thumbs, nor twiddle his hair, nor wriggle on his seat, nor bite his nails, nor—keep as grave a countenance as possible, from beginning to end, under pain of our highest displeasure. N.B.—The beaules have orders to keep a sharp look out."—*From an old Morning Chronicle.*

WAYSIDE GATHERINGS.

MUSIC is the art of the prophets; it is the only art which can calm the agitation of the soul and put the devil to flight.—*Luther.*

"PHILANTHROPY," says Rev. Sydney Smith, "is a universal sentiment of the human heart;" whenever A sees B in trouble, he always wants C to relieve him.

A CARLYLIAN SENTIMENT.—If you would have your laws obeyed without mutiny, see well to it that they are pieces of God Almighty's law — otherwise all the artillery of the world cannot keep down mutiny.

AN OBJECTION.—A skeptical man, urged to turn Roman Catholic, objected that it was a religion enjoining so many fasts and requiring such implicit faith: "You give us," he said, "too little to eat, and too much to swallow."

DR. RANDOLPH, a celebrated Spiritualist of New York, has openly recanted. He states it as his opinion, founded upon an experience of nine years as a medium, that Spiritualism is one-third imposture, one-third insanity, and one-third diabolism. He declares that insanity is the usual fate of trance mediums. He has received and accepted a call to the Christian ministry.

A TENDER REPROOF.—A little boy had one day done wrong, and was sent, after parental correction, to ask in secret the forgiveness of his Heavenly Father. His offence had been passion. Anxious to hear what he would say, his mother followed to the door of his room. In lisping accents she heard him ask to be made better—never to be angry again; and then, with child-like simplicity, he added, "Lord Jesus, make ma's temper better, too."

THINGS LOST FOREVER.—The following words from the pen of Lydia H. Sigourney are full of instructive meaning:—Lost wealth may be restored by industry; the wreck of health regained by temperance; forgotten knowledge restored by study; alienated friendship smoothed into forgetfulness; even forfeited reputation won by patience and virtue; but who ever looked upon his vanished hours, recalled his slighted years, stamped them with wisdom, or effaced from Heaven's record the fearful blot of wasted time. The foot-print on the sand is washed out by the ocean wave; and easier might we, when years are fled, find that foot-print than recall lost hours.

FACTS ARE STUBBORN THINGS.—Unitarians and Universalists are often charged, by preachers of eternal torments, with holding views which will lead to crime. Strange enough, do we find almost the whole of the criminals, Unitarians and Universalists? No. The following is from the Toronto, Canada, Prison Report, for 1857: the report says of the prisoners "913 were Roman Catholics; 765 were members of the Church of England; 152 Presbyterians; 64 Methodists; 3 Baptists, and 8 belonged to no denomination." It is not often we find so many orthodox Church members congregated under one roof! Think of 1,897 sincere believers in the evangelical doctrines of the immortal woe of their enemies assembled in one prison for crime!

ANY LORDS IN THE FAMILY?—"When the son of the Rev. Octavius Winslow, of Leamington, Warwick, was a mere child, one of his little playfellows, boasting of the number of noble relations he possessed, asked Young Winslow 'If he had any lords in his family?' He replied, 'As for that I don't know much; but my mamma says we have the Lord Jesus Christ for our elder brother.' "Honor enough, if we are but sure of the relationship. It is a joy to know that he is one of us; and with such a brother, and God our Father, who can boast a higher lineage?"

RIGHT IDEA OF A CHURCH.—The Church, therefore, should consist of those *who agree to unite as a Church, for the purpose of a Church.* I should include all, old and young, men and women, rich and poor, who desire to co-operate in serving Christ. It should include communicants and non-communicants, pewholders and non-pewholders. Its basis should be distinctly a Christian basis. *Co-operation* should be its life. *Communion* should be its food and support. It should not be built on the ministry, nor depend on having preaching every Sunday. With or without a minister, with or without a building, with or without public worship, it might still be a loving, living, and active Church of Christ.—*Christian Inquirer.*

READ THIS.—The English Presbyterians alone said—"We will have no creed but the Bible, with Reason for its interpreter, and wherever these will lead we are prepared to follow." They were the only body that were at liberty to move—and they did move. A free and reverent study of the scriptures brought them to their present position. We are not now defending that position, but pointing to a well known historical fact, that the only religious body which was at perfect liberty to change its views did actually change them and become Unitarian. What that fact implies we will not say, but that it is a fact no one who knows anything of ecclesiastical history will deny.—*Cheshire Observer, Feb. 12th, 1859.*

MICHAEL SERVETUS.—The descendants of Servet, or Servetus (the latinised form of the name), are residing at Lausanne. The family occupy a respectable position as tradespeople and *rentiers*. Servetus was not a Spaniard, as generally supposed, but a Frenchman, who graduated at a Spanish University, and came to Geneva. After the martyrdom of Servetus, the family fled from persecution to the Pays de Vaud (now Canton de Vaud), where their descendants still reside. Like their famed ancestor, they are decided anti-Calvinists. The letters of Calvin, recently discovered and published at Geneva, prove that the burning of Servetus was a cool and deliberate murder on the part of the Reformer, and that he was not merely an approver, but the sole instigator. It may not also be generally known that the descendants of the family of Socinus are living in the Canton of Solsieure; they are obscure tradesmen, very poor people, and Roman Catholics, and bear the name of Socin. Socinus is buried in the cathedral at Zurich.—*Durham Advertiser (Correspondent).*